In The Matter Of:

w.

PHILLIP R. BENNETT, et al.

TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE - Vol. 1 November 11, 2011

CONFIDENTIAL

MERRILL CORPORATION

LegaLink, Inc.

225 Varick Street 10th Floor New York, NY 10014 Phone: 212.557,7400 Fax: 212.692.9171

CONFIDENTIAL TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE - 11/11/2011

Page 1

CONFIDENTIAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----x
In re REFCO, INC. Securities Litigation

MARC S. KIRSCHNER, As Trustee of the Refco Private Actions Trust,

Plaintiff,

VS.

PHILLIP R. BENNETT, SANTO C. MAGGIO ROBERT C. TROSTEN, MAYER, BROWN LLP, MAYER BROWN INTERNATIONAL LLP, and GRANT THORNTON LLP,

Defendants.

07 MDL 1902 (JSR) 07 Civ. 8165 (JSR)

----X

November 11, 2011

11:00 a.m.

TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE BEFORE:

RONALD J. HEDGES, Special Master

Reported by: Mark Richman, CSR, RPR

Merrill Corporation - New York
1-800-325-3376 www.merrillcorp.com/law

CONFIDENTIAL TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE - 11/11/2011

1	Page 26		Page 28
1	CONFIDENTIAL	1	CONFIDENTIAL
11:19:36 2	yet?	11:21:01 2	going to have to go forward and we
11:19:36 3	MR. RAND: I do know, judge.	11:21:02 3	understand that.
11:19:38 4	I'm happy to enter into this. I	11:21:03 4	And what's going on really, I
11:19:41 5	enter with some trepidation because	11:21:04 5	think, is that Grant Thornton wants
11:19:43 6	I view this now as somewhat on the	11:21:06 6	to drive this out, make it very
11:19:45 7	substantive side and akin to	11:21:08 7	expensive, delay things and not let
11:19:46 8	summary judgment arguments that I	11:21:10 8	us go forward. If we are able to
11:19:48 9	expect Grant Thornton will make and	11:21:12 9	prove it up, well we all know
11:19:49 10	that day will come and we will be	11:21:13 10	what's going to happen. That's our
11:19:51 11	in front of Professor Capra and	11:21:14 11	burden.
11:19:53 12	Judge Rakoff on it.	11:21:14 12	MS. JOYCE: There is another
11:19:54 13	But simply put I would say	11:21:17 13	issue, Special Master Hedges.
11:19:57 14	this. Every single FX customer who	11:21:17 14	SPECIAL MASTER: Hold on one
11:19:59 15	has been deposed and will offer	11:21:18 15	second, Ms. Joyce. I'm just having
11:20:01 16	testimony has said had I known that	11:21:20 16	trouble understanding why you need
11:20:03 17	RCM was not a going concern, was	11:21:21 17	depositions to disprove something
11:20:06 18	insolvent or had financial	11:21:23 18	that according to you there's no
11:20:08 19	irregularities or the auditor	11:21:24 19	evidence on.
11:20:10 20	provided a qualified audit opinion,	11:21:25 20	MS. JOYCE: There's a separate
11:20:13 21	which this auditor didn't in	11:21:26 21	issue also on damages. The Trustee
11:20:14 22	unbelievable derogation of its	11:21:28 22	has taken the position that, and
11:20:16 23	obligations, if I had known that I	11:21:31 23	he's actually served his expert
11:20:18 24	never would have allowed my money	11:21:33 24	report on damages and has taken the
11:20:20 25	to move to RCM from where I was or	11:21:34 25	position that it is Grant
	Page 27		Page 29
1	CONFIDENTIAL		CONFIDENTIAL
11:20:22 2	I never would have allowed it to go	11:21:37 2	Thornton's burden to put forward
11:20:23 3	from Cargill to where it was and	11:21:40 3	evidence on mitigation of damages.
11:20:25 4	Cargill has said they never would	11:21:42 4	So his expert is going to put
11:20:27 5	have done the deal.	3	
111.20.21		3 1 1 • 2 1 • A A 5	in testimony related to what the
		11:21:44 5	in testimony related to what the
11:20:28 6	And so, respectfully, I don't	11:21:47 6	allowed claims were here and has
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts.
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated.
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16 11:20:45 17	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think is a completely untenable position,	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16 11:22:17 17	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that there was a settlement agreement
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16 11:20:45 17 11:20:48 18	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thomton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think is a completely untenable position, counterlogical, irrational.	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16 11:22:17 17 11:22:19 18	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that there was a settlement agreement between Stilton and Cargill. We
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16 11:20:45 17 11:20:48 18 11:20:49 19	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thomton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think is a completely untenable position, counterlogical, irrational. And ultimately I think, judge,	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16 11:22:17 17 11:22:19 18 11:22:21 19	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that there was a settlement agreement between Stilton and Cargill. We would have never have known that
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16 11:20:45 17 11:20:48 18 11:20:49 19 11:20:51 20	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thomton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think is a completely untenable position, counterlogical, irrational. And ultimately I think, judge, you've hit the nail on the head	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16 11:22:17 17 11:22:19 18 11:22:21 19 11:22:24 20	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that there was a settlement agreement between Stilton and Cargill. We would have never have known that information.
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16 11:20:45 17 11:20:48 18 11:20:49 19 11:20:51 20 11:20:53 21	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thomton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think is a completely untenable position, counterlogical, irrational. And ultimately I think, judge, you've hit the nail on the head which is that it is cumulative and	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16 11:22:17 17 11:22:19 18 11:22:21 19 11:22:24 20 11:22:24 21	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that there was a settlement agreement between Stilton and Cargill. We would have never have known that information. And I think and maybe I'm
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16 11:20:45 17 11:20:48 18 11:20:49 19 11:20:51 20 11:20:53 21 11:20:54 22	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think is a completely untenable position, counterlogical, irrational. And ultimately I think, judge, you've hit the nail on the head which is that it is cumulative and duplicative and ultimately if there	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16 11:22:17 17 11:22:19 18 11:22:21 19 11:22:24 20 11:22:24 21 11:22:24 22	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that there was a settlement agreement between Stilton and Cargill. We would have never have known that information. And I think and maybe I'm speaking out of turn here, but I
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16 11:20:45 17 11:20:48 18 11:20:49 19 11:20:51 20 11:20:53 21 11:20:54 22 11:20:57 23	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think is a completely untenable position, counterlogical, irrational. And ultimately I think, judge, you've hit the nail on the head which is that it is cumulative and duplicative and ultimately if there are problems in proof, it's our	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16 11:22:17 17 11:22:19 18 11:22:21 19 11:22:24 20 11:22:24 20 11:22:24 21 11:22:26 23	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that there was a settlement agreement between Stilton and Cargill. We would have never have known that information. And I think and maybe I'm speaking out of turn here, but I think that counsel for the Trustee
11:20:28 6 11:20:29 7 11:20:30 8 11:20:32 9 11:20:33 10 11:20:36 11 11:20:36 12 11:20:39 13 11:20:39 14 11:20:41 15 11:20:43 16 11:20:45 17 11:20:48 18 11:20:49 19 11:20:51 20 11:20:53 21 11:20:54 22	And so, respectfully, I don't think we have this causation problem. I don't think any more deposition testimony is going to elicit what Grant Thornton proffered that it thought it was going to get somehow from these customers, which is somehow they would have stayed at RCM or used RCM if they had known RCM was hopelessly insolvent which I think is a completely untenable position, counterlogical, irrational. And ultimately I think, judge, you've hit the nail on the head which is that it is cumulative and duplicative and ultimately if there	11:21:47 6 11:21:50 7 11:21:54 8 11:21:57 9 11:22:00 10 11:22:01 11 11:22:03 12 11:22:04 13 11:22:08 14 11:22:10 15 11:22:12 16 11:22:17 17 11:22:19 18 11:22:21 19 11:22:24 20 11:22:24 21 11:22:24 22	allowed claims were here and has not offered up any work or any testimony with regard to what the actual recoveries were here or set-off amounts. And the Trustee has taken the position that it's Grant Thornton's burden to move forward on proving what in fact was mitigated. We learned in the deposition of Stilton for the first time that there was a settlement agreement between Stilton and Cargill. We would have never have known that information. And I think and maybe I'm speaking out of turn here, but I

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

Merrill Corporation - New York
1-800-325-3376 www.merrillcorp.com/law

CONFIDENTIAL TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE - 11/11/2011

	Page 38		Page 40
1	CONFIDENTIAL	1	CONFIDENTIAL
11:27:59 2	I appreciate Grant Thornton's	11:29:45 2	not allowing depositions on
11:28:01 3	argument that the depositions of	11:29:47 3	liability but allowing them on
11:28:03 4	the remaining FX customers are	11:29:48 4	damages, include the bifurcation,
11:28:06 5	necessary to prove reliance. I	11:29:51 5	include the close of discovery.
11:28:08 6	disagree. It appears to me that	11:29:53 6	Now, when are all the expert
11:28:11 7	that is an obligation that the	11:29:56 7	reports going to be closed?
11:28:12 8	plaintiff has.	11:29:58 8	MR. RAND: We've already
11:28:14 9	I will give the plaintiff an	11:29:59 9	provided our expert reports to
11:28:15 10	opportunity until November 21 to	11:30:01 10	Grant Thornton. Grant Thornton is
11:28:19 11	identify any customers who the	11:30:02 11	providing its expert reports back
11:28:21 12	Trustee plans to present at trial,	11:30:04 12	to us on December 12th, with the
11:28:24 13	and also to identify any customers	11:30:08 13	exception of the damages expert
11:28:27 14	who must be gone to for	11:30:09 14	which will be 20 days, Grant
11:28:29 15	authentication purposes.	11:30:12 15	Thornton will provide their damages
11:28:31 16	Mr. Rand I believe agrees with	11:30:13 16	expert 20 days after the last FX
11:28:35 17	me, and whether he does or not, I	11:30:15 10	customer is taken and pursuant to
11:28:37 18	think it's correct that that burden	11:30:10 17	your ruling today, judge, on
11:28:38 19	of proof is on the Trustee and that	11:30:20 19	liability as it were, and then we
11:28:42 20	additional depositions frankly are	11:30:20 19	have 20 days to provide a reply.
11:28:44 21	unnecessary unless the plaintiff,	11:30:22 20	The reason we asked and agreed
11:28:46 22	unless the Trustee can put proofs	11:30:24 21	upon the Trustee providing a reply
11:28:49 23	on as to reliance.	11:30:20 22	expert report on damages was so the
11:28:50 24	So for the purposes of	11:30:31 24	parties would essentially at least
11:28:51 25	liability, I will not allow	11:30:31 24	have an opportunity to join issue
11.20.31		11.30.32 23	
3	Page 39	7	Page 41
1	CONFIDENTIAL	1	CONFIDENTIAL
11:28:53 2	additional depositions of FX	11:30:33 2	because of these mitigation
11:28:55 3	customers to be taken, if for no	11:30:35 3	discussions and issues that have
11:28:58 4	other reason then I think it's	11:30:36 4	been going around, so the experts
11:29:00 5	unreasonable and unnecessary under	11:30:38 5	wouldn't be talking past each other
11:29:02 6	rule 26 (b)(2)(c).	11:30:40 6	completely.
11:29:03 7	With regard to damages, based	11:30:40 7	SPECIAL MASTER: The damage
11:29:06 8	on the arguments of counsel, it	11:30:42 8	reports are adjourned without date
11:29:08 9	appears to me that the deposition	11:30:43 9	pending completion of the liability
11:29:10 10	testimony of all of the FX	11:30:44 10	trial. We don't need those for
11:29:12 11	customers may be necessary and may	11:30:48 11	trial now.
11:29:14 12	not be, as we go forward and get	11:30:50 12	Now, everything's going to be
11:29:16 13	all the expert reports in.	11:30:52 13	done then in a relatively early
11:29:18 14	I will bifurcate trial on	11:30:54 14	date. Is everyone planning on
11:29:20 15	liability and damages. If there is	11:30:56 15	deposing experts?
11:29:23 16	a need to take depositions of FX	11:30:57 16	MR. RAND: Yes, judge. We set
11:29:26 17	customers for purposes of damages,	11:30:59 17	January 27th as the expert
11:29:29 18	and that's what I understand we're	11:31:01 18	deposition cut off.
11:29:31 19	talking about with mitigation, I'll	11:31:05 19	SPECIAL MASTER: I'm just
11:29:33 20	address that later.	11:31:06 20	checking to make sure. I've got
11:29:35 21	Your fact discovery, all the	11:31:08 21	that order in front of me. I want
11:29:37 22	fact discovery and wrapping	11:31:09 22	to make sure we're not changing
11:29:39 23	everything up in this case is	11:31:11 23	anything.
11:29:41 24	closed by December 31.	11:31:11 24	Now, summary judgment motions.
11:29:43 25	Mr. Rand, you can include my	11:31:14 25	It sounds as if we should be now

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

Merrill Corporation - New York

1-800-325-3376

www.merrillcorp.com/law